UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,021	03/30/2004	Kazunari Tanaka	1095.1308	2782

21171   7590   08/21/2007

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
MAHMOOD, REZWANUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

_mn_/

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/812,021	TANAKA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rezwanul Mahmood	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 May 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070806

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the communication filed on May 17, 2007.

Response to Amendment

2.   Claims 1-11 are pending in this office action.

3.   To comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 119 applicant must submit a

Certified Copy of Foreign Priority Application translated in English

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed on May 17, 20067 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant argues that Feldman does not teach or even suggest the features "lay

out objects indicative of the documents, along the time axis, based on the time

information", "detecting a before-and-after relation in time between documents and

creating a display image where objects (indicative of the documents) are arranged on a

time axis" and "visually display a before-and-after relation in time between documents".

Examiner respectfully disagrees all of the allegations as argued. Examiner, in his

previous office action, gave detail explanation of claimed limitation "lay out objects

indicative of the documents, along the time axis, based on the time information" and

pointed out exact locations in the cited prior art.

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable

interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1]

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest

reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the

opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the

examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more

broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "detecting a before-and-after relation in time between documents and creating a

display image where objects (indicative of the documents) are arranged on a time axis"

and "visually display a before-and-after relation in time between documents") are not

recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re

Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Feldman teaches in Column 3 lines 55-67, Column 4 lines 1-13, Column 8 lines

46-67, Column 9 lines 1-3, Column 10 lines 45-67, Column 11 lines 1-4, Figure 1 and

Figure 6 the feature of lay out objects indicative of the documents, along a time axis,

based on the time information.

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action

was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Feldman (US Patent 6,532,469).

7.   With respect to claim 1, Feldman discloses a relation chart-creating program for

creating a relation chart representative of relations between a plurality of documents

(Feldman: Column 1, lines 44-54; Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Figure

1; Figure 6), the program causing a computer to:

analyze contents of each of the documents and extract feature elements

including time information therefrom (Feldman: Column 1, lines 44-54; Column 2, lines

43-48; Column 3, lines 1-6 and 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Column 7, lines 29-34 and

50-67);

calculate a degree of relevancy between each document pair extracted from the

documents, based on the extracted feature elements (Feldman: Column 3, lines 55-67;

Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55);

lay out objects indicative of the documents, along a time axis, based on the time

information, and generate association lines for connecting between the objects of each

document pair, depending on the calculated degree of relevancy (Feldman: Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Column 8, lines 46-67; Column 9, lines 1-3; Column 10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 1; Figure 6); and

display the relation chart composed of the objects and the association lines (Feldman: Column 4, lines 30-55; Figure 1; Figure 6).

8.   With respect to claim 2, Feldman discloses the relation chart-creating program according to claim 1, wherein when the association lines are generated, the association lines between predetermined ones of the document pairs are discarded for thinning-out based on the degree of relevancy of the document pair without citation relationship (Feldman: Column 1, lines 57-61; Column 9, lines 4-34; Figure 6).

9.   With respect to claim 3, Feldman discloses the relation chart-creating program according to claim 1, wherein when the association lines are generated, ones of the association lines between ones of the document pairs having the citation relationship are displayed in a form of display different from a form of display in which the others of the association lines are displayed (Feldman: Column 2, lines 61-67; Column 3, lines 29-32; Column 4, lines 30-55; Figure 6).

10.   With respect to claim 4, Feldman discloses the relation chart-creating program according to claim 1, wherein when the objects indicative of the documents are laid out, at least ones of the objects indicative of the document pairs having relevancy are

arranged along the time axis in an order based on the time information (Feldman:

Column 2, lines 43-48; Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55; Column

7, lines 29-34; Column 8, lines 46-67; Column 10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4;

Figure 6).

11.   With respect to claim 5, Feldman discloses the relation chart-creating program

according to claim 1, wherein when the objects indicative of the documents are laid out,

the objects indicative of the documents are arranged along the time axis in an order

based on the time information (Feldman: Column 2, lines 43-48; Column 3, lines 55-67;

Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55; Column 7, lines 29-34; Column 8, lines 46-67; Column

10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 6).

12.   With respect to claim 6, Feldman discloses the relation chart-creating program

according to claim 1, wherein when the objects indicative of the documents are laid out,

the time axis is represented in basic units each corresponding to a predetermined time

period, and the order along the time axis is preserved between objects indicative of the

documents belonging to different ones of the time periods (Feldman: Column 2, lines

43-48; Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55; Column 7, lines 29-34;

Column 8, lines 46-67; Column 10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 6).

13.   With respect to claim 7, Feldman discloses the relation chart-creating program

according to claim 1, wherein assuming that patent documents are inputted as the

plurality of documents, in extracting the feature elements, dates of application are

extracted as the time information (Feldman: Column 2, lines 43-48; Column 3, lines 55-

67; Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55; Column 7, lines 29-34; Column 8, lines 46-67;

Column 10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 6).

14.   With respect to claim 8, Feldman discloses the relation chart-creating program

according to claim 1, wherein assuming that patent documents are inputted as the

plurality of documents, in extracting the feature elements, dates of application and

priority dates are extracted as the time information (Feldman: Column 2, lines 43-48;

Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55; Column 7, lines 29-34; Column

8, lines 46-67; Column 10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 6), and

wherein when the objects indicative of the documents are laid out, if a date of

application and a priority date have been extracted from a document, the priority date is

regarded as the time information of the document (Feldman: Column 2, lines 43-48;

Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55; Column 7, lines 29-34; Column

8, lines 46-67; Column 10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 6).

15.   With respect to claim 9, Feldman discloses a method of creating a relation chart

representative of relations between a plurality of documents (Feldman: Column 1, lines

44-54; Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Figure 1; Figure 6), comprising the

steps of:

analyzing contents of each of the documents and extracting feature elements

including time information therefrom (Feldman: Column 1, lines 44-54; Column 2, lines

43-48; Column 3, lines 1-6 and 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Column 7, lines 29-34 and

50-67);

calculating a degree of relevancy between each document pair extracted from

the documents, based on the extracted feature elements (Feldman: Column 3, lines 55-

67; Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55);

laying out objects indicative of the documents, along a time axis, based on the

time information, and generating association lines for connecting between the objects of

each document pair, depending on the calculated degree of relevancy (Feldman:

Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Column 8, lines 46-67; Column 9, lines 1-

3; Column 10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 1; Figure 6); and

displaying the relation chart composed of the objects and the association lines

(Feldman: Column 4, lines 30-55; Figure 1; Figure 6).

16.   With respect to claim 10, Feldman discloses a relation chart-creating apparatus

for creating a relation chart representative of relations between a plurality of documents

(Feldman: Column 1, lines 44-54; Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Figure

1; Figure 6), comprising:

feature element-extracting means for analyzing contents of each of the

documents and extracting feature elements including time information (Feldman:

Column 1, lines 44-54; Column 2, lines 43-48; Column 3, lines 1-6 and 55-67; Column

4, lines 1-13; Column 7, lines 29-34 and 50-67);

relevancy-calculating means for calculating a degree of relevancy between each document pair extracted from the documents, based on the extracted feature elements (Feldman: Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55);

layout means for laying out objects indicative of the documents, along a time axis, based on the time information (Feldman: Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Column 8, lines 46-67; Column 9, lines 1-3; Column 10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 1; Figure 6);

association line-generating means for generating association lines for connecting between the objects of each document pair, depending on the calculated degree of relevancy; and

display means for displaying the relation chart composed of the objects and the association lines (Feldman: Column 4, lines 30-55; Figure 1; Figure 6).

17.   With respect to claim 11, Feldman discloses a computer-readable recording medium that records a relation chart-creating program for creating a relation chart representative of relations between a plurality of documents (Feldman: Column 1, lines 44-54; Column 3, lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Figure 1; Figure 6), the program causing a computer to:

analyze contents of each of the documents and extract feature elements including time information therefrom (Feldman: Column 1, lines 44-54; Column 2, lines 43-48; Column 3, lines 1-6 and 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Column 7, lines 29-34 and 50-67);

calculate a degree of relevancy between each document pair extracted from the

documents, based on the extracted feature elements (Feldman: Column 3, lines 55-67;

Column 4, lines 1-13 and 30-55);

lay out objects indicative of the documents, along a time axis, based on the time

information, and generate association lines for connecting between the objects of each

document pair, depending on the calculated degree of relevancy (Feldman: Column 3,

lines 55-67; Column 4, lines 1-13; Column 8, lines 46-67; Column 9, lines 1-3; Column

10, lines 45-67; Column 11, lines 1-4; Figure 1; Figure 6); and

display the relation chart composed of the objects and the association lines

(Feldman: Column 4, lines 30-55; Figure 1; Figure 6).

Conclusion

18.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

19.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. The Kumar reference (US Patent 5,982,383) teaches about

generating graphics charts. The Lavoie reference (US Publication 2005/0015716)

teaches about a document change identifier.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rezwanul Mahmood whose telephone number is (571)272-5625. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 10 A.M. - 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571)272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rezwanul Mahmood
Examiner
Art Unit 2164

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 6, 2007